



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/045,518	03/20/1998	ANDREW S. VAN LUCHENE	WD2-97-561	1021

22927 7590 02/12/2002

WALKER DIGITAL  
FIVE HIGH RIDGE PARK  
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER
----------

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/045,518

Applicant(s)

Van Luchene

Examiner

James W. Myhre

Group Art Unit

2162



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Myhre

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Dean Alderucci

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 6, 2000Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1-7 and 31

Identification of prior art discussed:

Eleftheriou (5,869,826)Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant Representative discussed the 35 U.S.C. 101 and 103 rejections of the claims. Examiner clarified the reasons behind the 101 rejection and how the Applicant could possibly tranverse the rejection. Applicant Representative agreed to amend the first set of claims to overcome the 101 rejection and to prevent the claim from reading on receiving the rounding code from an internal storage media. Applicant Representative and Examiner discussed the differences between the cited references and the Examiner's Affidavit about rounding off purchase prices and the methods discussed in the specification. Examiner also suggested that new Claim 31 could possibly be written more clearly to identify the item from which the rounding code was received. The Applicant's Representative believed that the claim clearly identified this feature as it presently stood.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

James W. MYHRE  
Patent Examiner